

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 25 – 69 are pending in the application. Claims 12 – 24 are canceled without prejudice.

The paragraph starting at page 4, line 20 has been amended in order to incorporate text from original claim 5 and to clarify the description. The paragraph starting at page 5, line 22 has been amended to clarify the description. Further, claims 12-24 have been canceled and new claims 25-69 have been added. No new matter has been added by this amendment and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Representative support for new claims 25-69 can be found, e.g., at page 2, lines 7-8 and lines 15-17, page 3, lines 8-13, page 4, lines 4-5 and 14-15, page 5, line 22 to page 6, line 5, page 6, line 15 to page 7, line 9 and page 8, lines 7-12 of the English translation of the original description and original claims 1-11.

It is noted that the present application is the US national stage of an International (PCT) application. Therefore, the unity of invention rules apply to the present claims and it is respectfully believed that new claims 25-69 are linked by a common general inventive concept in accordance with MPEP 1893.03(d). As a result, claims 25-69 can be examined together.

In the non-final Office Action mailed May 15, 2003, claims 12-24 were rejected over one or more of Kuemin et al (WO 96/28535), Shiino et al (US 5,574,002), VanEenam (US 5,080,831) and Dishart et al (US 5,096,501). Applicants believe that new claims 25-69 distinguish from these references for the following reasons.

Kuemin et al, Shiino et al., VanEenam, and Dishart et al. are easily

distinguishable from the new claims for at least the reason that none of these references teaches a solution of water and first and second glycol ethers according to claims 25 and 52 or a solution of water, propylene-glycol-ether and glycol-ether-acetate according to claims 37 and 62. With respect to VanEenam, it is specifically noted that the passage at column 4, lines 60-66 states: „organic solvents having an aqueous solubility in excess of approximately 6 weight percent such as propylene glycol monomethyl ether acetate . . . are not useful in the practice of the invention.“ (Emphasis added). Thus, VanEenam actually teaches away from the present claims and can not be utilized to support an obviousness rejection in view of the last paragraph of MPEP 2141.02 (portions of the prior art reference that teach away from the claims also must be considered) and the last paragraph of MPEP 2143.01 (proposed modification cannot render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose).

For all the foregoing reasons, new claims 25-69 are believed to be in a condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert W. Becker, Reg. No. 26,255  
for applicant(s)

ROBERT W. BECKER & ASSOCIATES  
707 Highway 66 East, Suite B  
Tijeras, NM 87059  
RWB:mac

Telephone: (505) 286-3511  
Facsimile: (505) 286-3524